UNITY

FREEDOM FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor 1880-1918)

Editors

John Haynes Holmes Francis Neilson

The Pest of Denominationalism

By JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

A Naval Holiday

By FRANCIS NEILSON

Recent Books About Birth Control

By SUSAN QUACKENBUSH

VOLUME LXXXVII NUMBER 2

Chicago, March 10, 1921

PUBLISHED WEEKLY

UNITY

$3.00 PER ANNUM.

ESTABLISHED 1878

With THE FREE RELIGIOUS ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, THE CONGRESS OF RELIGIONS, and all other organizations and individuals seeking to widen fellowship and to realize the Brotherhood of the Spirit unrimmed by creed, form or sectarian prejudices

Vol. 1 March 1, 1878 No. 1

THE

Pamphlet Mission

FOR

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP & CHARACTER

IN

RELIGION.

Publishing Committee:

Robert Collyer, Chicago. Wm. C. Gannett, St. Paul.
Jenkin Ll. Jones, Janesville. C. W. Wendte, Cincinnati.
J. C. Learned, St. Louis.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY AT 65 WASHINGTON ST., CHICAGO.
Per Year, $1.50. Single Number, 10 Cents.

Frances L. Roberts, 65 Washington St., Chicago, Business Agent.
J. T. Sunderland, 65 Washington St., Chicago, } Editors of
Geo. W. Cooke, Grand Haven, Mich., } "Notes and News."

EDITORS
JOHN HAYNES HOLMES
FRANCIS NEILSON

ASSISTANT EDITOR
EDITH LLOYD JONES

EDITORIAL CONTRIBUTORS

Charles E. Beals
Harry Foster Burns
Charles W. Casson
George Willis Cooke
Percy M. Dawson
Frank C. Doan
Charles F. Dole
James Waldo Fawcett
Zona Gale
Emil G. Hirsch
Chester Lloyd Jones
David Starr Jordan
George Grover Mills
Susan M. Quackenbush
Frederick Starr
Jabez T. Sunderland
Albert R. Vail
Arthur L. Weatherly
James H. West

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Boulevard, CHICAGO, ILL.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter, January 12, 1899, at the Postoffice at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

Sample Copies of UNITY Sent Upon Request

DREXEL State Bank

Cottage Grove Ave. *and* Oakwood Blvd.

Thirty-two years of conservative banking, combined with service and courtesy for every depositor —large or small—is the record of this bank . . . . . .

Your savings and checking account cordially invited

Resources Six and one-half Million Dollars

Contents:

EDITORIAL—
Notes.—J. H. H. 19
The Pest of Denominationalism.—John Haynes Holmes 21

THE PULPIT—
What Does It Mean to Love God? (*Concluded*).—John Haynes Holmes 23

CONTRIBUTED—
A Naval Holiday.—Francis Neilson..... 26

SELECTED—
A Saint of the New Dispensation.—*The Indian Messenger* 28
Endowment Fund Letters..... 31

THE STUDY TABLE—
Recent Books About Birth Control.—Susan Quackenbush 29

POETRY—
Three Poems of Cheer.—*Mrs. Edwin Markham*..... 19
Questionnaire.—*William Griffith* 23
Poem.—*Gertrude Helena Urban*..... 23
Dr. Anna Shaw.—*The Commoner*..... 25
After Many Days.—James Waldo Fawcett..... 25

THE FIELD—
Unity 31
The Association to Abolish War—Our Aims..... 31

UNITY

"HE HATH MADE OF ONE ALL NATIONS OF MEN"

VOL. LXXXVII THURSDAY, MARCH 10, 1921 NUMBER 2

THREE POEMS OF CHEER.

Faith

Does scarlet conflagration blot the sky
Leaving the ruined earth all wounds and scars?
Not with wild flames keep faith, but with the stars
That all unchangeably above, go by!

Choice

The daily filaments of word and deed,
Are woven into fateful threads, that feed
The endless web of destiny, and knit
Our spirit's raiment for the Infinite.

Ask Not

Make no hard bargain, claiming love for love:
Be like the all-bestowing sun above
Outpouring on the whole world love and light,
Yet asking none to reckon, nor requite.

Nautilus. —*Mrs. Edwin Markham.*

We are informed by the Trustees of UNITY that an Endowment Fund Committee is now seeking to raise a sum of fifty thousand dollars ($50,000) to add to the thirty thousand dollars ($30,000) now in hand which was raised during the latter years of the life of Jenkin Lloyd Jones. When this original endowment was secured, it was felt that the income derived therefrom would easily cover the deficit which seems to be inevitable in the publication of religious periodicals in these modern days. Since that time, however, printing costs have trebled, and the annual deficit is therefore still with us. Hence the appeal which the Trustees have voted for this larger fund! That the appeal will be answered, we have no doubt. We have an abiding confidence that idealistic work, faithfully performed, is its own best witness, and wins of itself the support which it must have. For more than forty years Jenkin Lloyd Jones lifted his voice in these columns, often as one crying in the wilderness; and through all these years, friends near and far brought sustenance, as the ravens to Elijah. Today UNITY stands as Mr. Jones's monument—the heir of his spirit after death, as it was in life-the favorite child of his great heart. Today, as yesterday, we know support will come, for this monument must stand—at once a milestone on the journey thus far done, and a signpost to the road that lies ahead!

Mr. Harding's cabinet is frankly disappointing. The country had long since become reconciled to the President's undisguised personal mediocrity, through the assurance that he would surround himself in the Cabinet Chamber with men whose knowledge, experience and ability would more than compensate for his own deficiencies. Both before and after election, we were taught to believe that the Harding administration would be in the hands of "a Cabinet of the Talents." Now we are given a list of appointees who represent nothing better than a mixture of good and bad, in the proportion of about three or four to one on the wrong side. Mr. Hoover represents the best, as Mr. Daugherty most certainly represents the worst. It is evident that Mr. Harding's good intentions, which are unquestionable, have been undermined by the necessity from which he has found no way of escape, of recognizing personal and political obligations. The result is a Cabinet composed predominantly of politicians and personal friends rather than of statesmen. Incidentally it is a group of men who represent a larger aggregation of wealth than has ever before been brought together in the entire history of the government. We hope that the Cabinet will write a better record than now seems promised, but we confess that our hopes at this moment are not high. Mr. Harding has made not so much a bad as a disappointing beginning.

Good for Senator Borah! His oration on behalf of civil liberties, spoken in the Senate on February 26th last, was worthy of his exalted theme. And the bill, the introduction of which was the occasion of his utterance, seems to mean business. It provides, among other things, that any state or local officer who interferes with any citizen's right to free speech, or attempts to break up any meeting held for purposes of public discussion, shall be liable to fine or imprisonment; or both. It also provides that any state or local officer "seizing books or papers without a warrant" shall be fined $10,000 and sentenced to five years in prison. Similar punishments are provided for federal officials who "injure, oppress, threaten, or intimidate any person in the free exercise or enjoyment of any right guaranteed to him by the Constitution or laws of the United States." Senator Borah well points out that violation of civil rights by government officials is on the increase, and "that the private citizen under such conditions is practically without recourse." Criticism or denunciation of offending officials gets us nowhere. What is needed is the arming of the citizen with a legal weapon for the vindication of his outraged privileges and rights—and this the Borah bill provides. If there is any liberal sentiment left in America, it will rally to this legislation. Indeed, the response which this proposal awakens may be taken as a fair measure of how much idealism is left to us these parlous days.

The American Federation of Labor is greatly disturbed over present industrial conditions in this country. Its officers, who gathered in conference in Washington in the last week in February, called upon the workers to resist all injunctions against trade union activities, to break the "Open Shop" campaign, to preserve and improve existing standards of wages and labor, and to fight to the finish against all such malign legislation as the Industrial Court laws which are now becoming so popular. There is something ironical, if not positively amusing, in the distress to which the Federation now so freely confesses, for there is nothing in the world to blame for the present plight of trade union workers but their own blindness and stupidity. Three things, for which they are themselves alone responsible, have brought about the present situation. In the first place, the trade unionists gave ungrudging support to a war which was plainly the expression of capitalistic and imperialistic greed, and used this tragedy for the most selfish improvement of their own individual and class interests. In the second place, they joined the reactionary forces of government and industry in persecuting the radical groups in the labor world. The outrages of oppression which they gladly helped to visit upon the Socialists, the Communists and the I. W. W.'s, have now like so many boomerangs returned upon their own heads. Lastly, they are paying the penalty today of a policy, stoutly adhered to through more than a generation, of limiting their reform activities to such petty and inconsequential matters as higher wages, shorter hours and improved conditions of toil. The trade unionists of America have always been willing to strike hands with the existing system of industry and defend it whenever it has been placed in jeopardy. That a reactionary capitalism is now taking advantage of a period of industrial depression to discipline organized labor to a more abject subserviency, is only what is to be expected. Why should the American Federation of Labor get so excited over consequences which are the direct product of the industrial system which it sustains? Will Mr. Gompers and his supporters never learn anything? Will they dance forever to the piper who plays the tune of death?

Some day a war between England and America may break out. When that day comes every red-blooded American will know that England is to blame, and must be destroyed that civilization may survive. In the same way, every true Englishman will know that America is to blame, and must be similarly destroyed. Citizens of neither nation at that moment of terror and excitement will be able to recognize that the war has come only because it was carefully plotted and prepared for by junker groups in both countries. Before the whirlwind is upon us, therefore, let us make note of our responsibility for its coming. Take, for example, the recent utterance in New York of Rear Admiral H. M. Huse, now on the active list of the United States Navy, "that we shall have to have a navy large enough to fight England." What is this, we ask, but a deliberate laying of the powder train leading to the explosives which are unfortunately present in the public life of both England and America? In a recent address at the National Liberal Club in London, Viscount Grey declared that war between the United States and the British Empire was "unthinkable and inconceivable." Unfortunately, in this paradoxical world of ours, many things "unthinkable and inconceivable" have come to pass in course of time. One of these, a war between England and America, is certain to come if admirals who ought to know better keep on talking about building navies large enough to fight the other country. If we were the President, we would strip Admiral Huse of his decorations and honors, and discharge him from the Navy in disgrace. Even such dire punishment is inadequate for such an offense against the comity of nations.

Rabindranath Tagore is a different man today from what he was on his earlier visit to this country during the war. In the first place, he is not "Sir" but "Dr." Tagore; his knightly title, repudiated because of England's tyrannous rule of his native country, gives way to a title which tells of his eminence in the realm not of empire but of letters and learning. Then, in his speech and personal bearing, there is a new note of leadership in world affairs. He is still the poet and mystic; but he is also today the prophet in the old Israelitish sense. Hitherto, he has spoken as the Psalmist. Now he speaks also as an Isaiah, stricken by the woes of his people, and lifted to ecstatic vision of a new world of justice and of peace. This attitude was foreshadowed in his great addresses on "Nationalism," written and delivered in 1916-1917. But what was there in bud, so to speak, is now in blossom full-blown. Note, for example, his recent statement on the League!

> "The League of Nations," he says, "is a league of robbers. It is founded on force—it has no spiritual foundation. . . . A new machine is of little value if it be run by the old power and for the old ends. Organization is not brotherhood, and God cares more for a brother than he does for an empire. The Great War was one of the blows of God seeking to break down our materialism, our selfishness, our narrow nationalisms. It made a dent, but only a dent, in the crust. Other blows will fall betimes."

We have seen many statements about the war and its titanic failure, but none sounder than this of the Indian seer. It is at once accurate diagnosis and unerring prophecy. Tagore, for years one of the world's greatest men, looms greater today than ever.

A few weeks ago, in commenting on Dean Inge's plea for forgiveness of the Germans, we said, "Perhaps the time is near at hand when it may be safe to

read the Sermon on the Mount, and even to use its golden texts as themes for sermons." In saying this, we were flattering ourselves that we were delicately ironical! We never realized that we were setting down the soberest kind of truth. But listen to this! The Association to Abolish War is reprinting and circulating the Sermon on the Mount in a four-page leaflet. This is headed by the words, "Now It Can Be Printed"; and a note is added stating that in 1917 a member of the Association proposed to print the Sermon on the Mount, without note or comment, for free distribution. The Secretary of the Association, Wilbur K. Thomas, was officially informed by the Department of Justice that such a procedure would be regarded by the government as *"pro-German."* We have heard remarkable tales in the last few years, but this strikes us as "the limit." If any of our readers know of anything that is more "raw," we beg them to send it in. We confess we would like to see it.

To persons interested in the contemporary religious problem, we commend a careful reading of a new book, "Shall We Stand by the Church," written by Professor Durant Drake of Vassar College. Professor Drake is no merciful critic. A firm believer in the church, he blinks his eyes to none of the factors involved in the present desperate situation of organized Protestantism. He knows that the churches are going to pieces, and very largely because of their own utter failure to measure up to the inexorable spiritual challenges of the present day. But he has hope of recovery, and lays down a program of change to this end which means a religious revolution. With the community church idea he has deep sympathy. Carrying this out to its logical conclusions, he writes:

> If the churches were taken away entirely from sectarian control and run as the schools are by the community, as a public concern too important to be left to private interests, we might perhaps see a renaissance of religion parallel to the development of education since that great field of activity passed into the hands of the public.

In conclusion, he declares that:

> It is a crucial epoch in the history of Christianity. . . . The future of religion among us hangs in the balance, and with it, in no inconsiderable degree, the future of humanity.

The Pest of Denominationalism

From California there comes to us an enormously interesting and significant letter, which reads in part as follows:

> The settlement of new lands and establishment of new communities is taking place rapidly in this section of the far West.
>
> As practically the entire capital and resources of the settlers are needed in the development of the land which they are settling, little money is available for the building of churches and community centers.
>
> One would naturally think that under these conditions all the resources available would be gathered together in a spirit of co-operation, that every one would join together in bringing about conditions which every one more or less desires. Strange to say, however, we find small groups of almost every denomination and type of religion planning to get started first.

Here is a typical statement of what has happened for generations, and is still happening, here in America. There was a time when it was natural, if not inevitable, that the various Protestant denominations should invade a community and compete for the allegiance of its citizens. Men believed in those days that it made a literally eternal difference as to whether a man were a Baptist, a Methodist or a Presbyterian. A town might be well supplied with churches of various kinds; but if a devout Congregationalist, let us say, discovered that among these churches there was no Congregational church, then it was his duty to supply the lack, for to be a Congregationalist was the only right way to be a Christian. When such ideas prevailed, there was something superlatively fine, after all, in the way in which sincere sectarians labored for their cause. They counted themselves witnesses of the one true gospel—custodians of the faith once delivered to the saints; and no sacrifice was too great, no labor too long, no zeal too exclusive, for the service of their church. They had the secret of life—no man could be saved except by them! Why therefore should they not thrust their presence upon every community, regardless of the number of churches already busily at work? The fact that there were so many churches which were not the true church, was only added reason for undertaking to save misguided people from the wrong to the right pathway of redemption.

There are still people, we know, who retain this concept of exclusive revelation. In matters of doctrine, ritual and ecclesiastical order, they are right and all others are wrong, and the difference is as wide as the cosmic gulf betwixt heaven and hell! But such persons exert no dominant influence today on the social life of the country, and only in remote localities constitute a majority of the population. Most people, in our time, understand religion in the broader sense of the word, as a way of life. They see in creeds and forms of worship and methods of organization and government, only such differences of opinion, temperament and habit as are inevitable in the lives of men. Different people react differently, think differently, feel differently, that is all; but at bottom they are moved by the same impulses of devotion, challenged by the same high obligations of service. In religion, as in no other one experience of life, men should be not divided but united. They should live in the one spirit, even as they walk in the one light. For in spite of all "diversities of gifts . . . administrations . . . operations," there is still "one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all who is above all, and through all, and in you all."

It is this idea of spiritual unity which is the domi-

nant religious note of our time. Unconsciously it is sinking deep into the souls of men, teaching them a discontent with organized religion which already has cast the blight of death over our churches, and is destined eventually to achieve a revolution as momentous as that which shook the world in the 16th century. And yet, in the face of these profound changes in the faith and order of this present day, the propaganda of denominationalism is being pushed as vigorously as ever! Denominational agents and field secretaries are everywhere, sustaining old churches and planting new churches, not because these churches are wanted or needed, but because it is necessary for the prestige of the denomination that they should appear. The very fact that communities no longer produce or sustain these sectarian institutions themselves, but receive them at the hands of organized invaders from without, shows clearly how remote is organized religion today from the lives of the great masses of the people. The old "urge" has disappeared; no longer is there any considerable number of persons in any church who think that their neighbors are any better or worse for belonging to this church, or that church, or no church at all. We are simply getting altogether out of the way these days of identifying the one true faith with any one particular church, or indeed of believing at all, theologically speaking, that there is any such thing as a "one true faith." If our denominations still exist, it is only because they always have existed; if they are pushing their own particular cause in town and city, it is only because officers must earn salaries, and annual reports must show gains; if they are still competing savagely, minister against minister, church against church, in countless places where the people would gladly be as united religiously as they are socially, it is only because they hope that, in the competition, they will be the ones ultimately to triumph and survive. Denominationalism has always been a scandal; in the old days, however, when the conviction of exclusive truth as the means of salvation possessed the souls of men, it had a certain *raison d'etre* and even dignity, which are now quite lost in the sordid scramble for material power and prestige.

Illustrations of what denominationalism means today, abound. In a town of a few thousand inhabitants, located not a hundred miles from New York, there was started in the early days of the community's development, a union church. This church was the church of the town; it belonged to everybody and served everybody, just like the public school and the library. The people, of course, thought differently on theological questions, and represented many diverse ecclesiastical traditions — but this made no trouble. Prayer and praise were a mutual experience, and the work of social betterment a common work. And so everybody took hold, and the church prospered, and the community was spiritually as a single family.

Then as the town grew and began at last to get respectable train service, the denominational field agents began to appear. Were there any Presbyterians in the place? Yes—a few! Then of course they must have a church of their own; for of what use are Presbyterians, or a town in which Presbyterians live, if there is not a Presbyterian church on the landscape? But there were not enough Presbyterians to support a separate church! Ah, that makes no difference, the presbytery has funds for church extension work, and will gladly build and sustain your church if you will attend its services. So the church was built, and all the Presbyterians successfully drawn off into a place by themselves, where they could learn to nurse their differences and think of how much better Christians they were than their neighbors. Then, like a stream of traveling salesmen, drumming for business, came the field agents of other demoninations. Church after church was erected by outside funds, plastered with a divisive sectarian name, placed in charge of an underpaid clergyman whose job it was to beat down the business of all his spiritual competitors. Today, the town has more than one church per thousand inhabitants; no one of these churches, except the original union church, is self-supporting; and the community, happily united on six days of the week, is unhappily divided into a dozen or more hostile religious factions on the seventh day!

What we have in such a situation as this is a pest—the pest of denominationalism! It is a pest just as fatal to spiritual life as the gypsy moth, for example, is fatal to arboreal life. And it is the coming of this pest to as yet unravaged communities in California that our correspondent foresees and rightly fears. The denominational agents, like the caterpillars in the spring, are evidently on the ground. They are preparing to strip the people of every spontaneous growth of religious idealism, as the moths prepare to strip the trees of their fresh green leaves. Our Californian correspondent, representative, we believe, of a rapidly growing number of people in this country, is impatient at the spectacle. He sees its economic waste, and we hope also its spiritual scandal. He protests, as all right-minded men must more and more protest. What is more, he seeks to ward off the pest before it takes hold and begins its work of destruction. And he has found the remedy, or so at least we believe. For in this same letter, quoted above, he inquires about the *community church,* and asks how it may be organized in these communities which he describes!

Right here, in this instance, do we have an epitome of what is going on in America today. Our religious life, as a free and progressive people, is being devoured by a loathsome pest. Slowly but surely, we

are rousing ourselves against it, and seeking a remedy which shall liberate our souls from devastation and enable them to blossom unto their appointed spiritual fruitage. At last we see the remedy at hand in the community church. "The religion of America," says Dr. Elisha M. Friedman, in *America and the New Era,* "will integrate its diverse cultures." This is sound prophecy; and we may be sure that the integration will shape itself into an institution as inclusive, free and democratic as American life itself. To the extent that the community church is such an institution, it is the church of the future.

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

QUESTIONNAIRE.

I went into the woods to make a song,
Wherewith to buy
My love a gown.

So sang a poet and a lord of rhyme,
Making the chimes of spring
In autumn chime.

I fled the woods and brought flower words along,
Made of a sigh,
Freshly to town.

Fresh and wood-wild, they harbored something strange
In every note,
Something flower-shy.

Singing of beauty, careless of renown,
Veiled in a cloud, to fling
Silver rain down!

Hushed is the song. Was it lacking in range?
Needed my throat
More of the sky?

Or was it a lack—a lack of the town?
Who could be wrong,
I, the town, or the song?

Ainslee's. —*William Griffith.*

I love the huge sphinx of the desert more
Than prêtty carving on a cherry stone.
I love wild Triton when the horn is blown
That sends the flying columns in uproar:
Column following column, his artillery pour,
Till the white cavalcades ride on alone,
Foaming at mouth, and, mad with monotone,
The hoofs of ocean thunder on the shore!
I love a woman's tender sacrament,
But ne'er so sacrificial love goes cheap.
I love a woman grand, belligerent,
Lifts one his voice to lay her truth asleep.
O soul, in some high passion torn and spent,
How art thou radiant in thy discontent!

—*Gertrude Helena Urban.*

Sons of God and Daughters of Men.
Sherman, French & Co.

THE PULPIT

What Does It Mean to Love God?

By John Haynes Holmes, Minister of the Community Church, New York City

(Continued from last issue.)

So much for the invisible as it reveals itself in space! This brings us to a second and deeper consideration, namely, the invisible as it reveals itself in *time.* From the standpoint of the living man, all time is divided, like Cæsar's Gaul, into three parts—the past, the present and the future. Now the past and present can be classified together, for our purposes at least, as that portion of time which is visible; it has been seen, or is being seen, and is therefore a part of the definite experience of mankind. The future, however, is that portion of time which is invisible. We know that it is coming—we see it coming, as we watch that amazing process of one minute passing into another. But until it comes, it remains invisible in the sense that we do not know what it is, or what it may bring to us of happiness or ill. The most that we can do with the future, so far as vision is concerned, is to foresee it—to prophesy that when it comes, it will be so-and-so. But it is an old proverb that "hind-sight is better than foresight," by which we mean that it is the past, after all, and not the future, which is really visible.

Now, in the realm of time, exactly as in the realm of space, most men prefer to live in the midst of things visible, and not invisible. We feel most contented when we are dwelling in the past, with its ancient traditions, its venerable institutions, its familiar ways and customs sanctified by the practice of generations. To accept what our fathers have taught us, to follow the example which they tried and set, is like sailing a sea which has been charted in every square mile of its area. In this kind of a life there is nothing undiscovered or unexpected; we know everything that there is to be known, and therefore run as little risk of disaster as of adventure. Some men there are, of course, who feel the monotony and even deadness of such a life as this; and these men move up heroically from the past into the present. They live in the new experiences of their own generation instead of in the old experiences of their progenitors; but they still cling to things visible, as the medieval mariner, who timidly made his way out of the Mediterranean into the Atlantic, clinging fast to European shores. Only now and then do we find a man who puts both past and present deliberately behind him and launches boldly out into the invisible reaches of the future. A few of these men appear in every generation; they comprise the "glorious company of the apostles, the goodly fellowship of the prophets, the noble army of martyrs," of which the prayer book speaks. And these men are all characterized by a single remarkable fact! They see within their souls a vision of a better world than has yet been established upon the earth. They behold as in a dream a future age when all men will be happy, when cold, starvation and disease will be no more, when justice will be done and peace established, when "love (will be) shining in every face (and) there will be no more sin, no pain, no loss, no death." They see a society so new and wonderful that it can be de-

scribed in no terms that are associated with the society that now exists. They see, as Isaiah saw, the coming of a time when men "shall build the old wastes, and raise up the former desolations . . . . and everlasting joy shall be unto them. . . . . For as the earth bringeth forth her bud, and as the garden causeth the things that are sown into it to spring forth, so the Lord will cause righteousness and praise to spring forth before all nations."

Now these are the men, the chosen of every generation, who live in the future, as the great masses of other men live in the present and the past. They burst the barriers of time, as other men burst the barriers of space. They seek the invisible, in deliberate rejection and defiance of the visible, and they do this because to them there is no choice between the two. Not the inheritances of the past and the realities of the present, but the promises of the future, constitute the real world. The invisible ahead, and not the visible behind and around, alone truly exists. In this future, therefore, they must live; for it, if necessary, they must die. They will "endure" all things—persecution, outlawry, suffering, ignominy, martyrdom—if only they can hasten its coming upon the earth. This coming may not transpire in their own time—probably will not—but this can make no difference in their service. They must still live for it, as the sole reality. Here is the very essence, as I see it, of heroism and devotion. To labor for no gains that can now be seen—to sacrifice for rewards which will be paid not to yourself but to your children or your children's children—to live and mayhap die for a happier day which you yourself can never hope to witness or enjoy—this, to my mind, is the crowning achievement of the soul. Thousands of men and women, with no hope even of later fame and glory in the world, have been content thus to sow their seeds of faith, and leave to later ages the reaping of the harvest. And they have done this because they have believed "with all their heart and mind and soul and strength" in this future which is invisible. And what is this, I ask you, but believing in and loving "him who is invisible"—namely, God? These prophets, martyrs and reformers—these heroes, young and old, who have dreamed their dreams and seen their visions—they are simply those who walk in the footsteps of Abraham, of whom it was said that he "looked for a city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God." To live for the future and its promises, to seek the Kingdom among men—this is one way at least of loving God.

It should be obvious, by this time, that this clue of the invisible is leading us to some definite answers to the question as to what it means to love God, "whom (we) have not seen." Taking this "invisible," first of all, as it appears in the realm of space, we found it suggested that a man loves God when he moves beyond the fixed horizon of his little world, and launches out upon some adventure of the soul, a quest of truth, or a quest of service and compassion for the outcast and unfortunate among his fellowmen. Secondly, taking this "invisible" as it appears in the realm of time, we found that a man may be said to love God when he emancipates himself from the bondage of past and present, and reaches forth into the future of a better world, and gives himself unstintingly not to the preservation of what has been and now is, but to the creation or fulfillment of what may and ought to be. But not yet have we sounded the depths of our problem, for there is another and more fundamental realm where the invisible appears—that realm lying altogether outside the borders of time and space, which we call, for lack of a better word, perhaps, the realm of the *spirit*.

If we ask what is the difference between an animal and a man, we find it, among other things, in the fact that the animal lives exclusively in the field of physical or material things, whereas the man, if he be true to his own best self, lives only incidentally in this field. The life of the animal is concerned from birth to death with matters pertaining to physical sustenance and sensation. To get and to beget marks the whole round of his existence. Everything that concerns him can be seen and felt and handled. His world is a material world, and he devotes every moment of his time to the satisfaction of material purposes.

A man, on the other hand, if he be in the true sense of the word a man, lives only incidentally and occasionally in the material realm. At bottom, of course, he is an animal, in the sense that, as a condition of survival, he must respond to certain physical appetites and needs. But no man who is really a man is content to exist on this low plane of animal experience. Just to the extent that he is a man and not an animal, he finds himself concerned primarily with certain things which never enter into the life of the animal at all. What these things are, it is difficult to say. They seem to belong not to the outer world which we can see and touch, but to a mysterious inner world which is quite beyond our reach. They relate themselves not to any functional sensations of the body, but to certain extraordinary processes of the soul which we call thought and emotion. In themselves they are imponderable, intangible, invisible—as unreal and baffling as the wind, which "bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but knowest not whence it cometh or whither it goeth." Their invisible quality is what is perhaps most distinctive of these things which characterize the man as contrasted with the animal. How often in life do we see a man who deliberately ignores or defies those things which make up the whole sum and substance of the animal's existence! Terence MacSwiney, for example, who did what no animal could do—go without food until starvation killed the body! When we look for the objects for which such a man was living, the things which he was hoping to gain for himself or others—we seek for them in vain. They cannot be seen, as the food may be seen, which is the be-all and end-all of the animal's existence. Of course, they exist—exist so surely that a man is willing to give all the material blessings which life can hold, for their dear sake. But they exist in that world of the invisible, where eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, but where the heart of man hath none the less conceived!

Now, it is these realities, which are thus so distinctive of human beings, which constitute what we mean by the things of the spirit. They are those forces of the inner life of man which are so unreal that they can be seen by no microscope, and measured by no balances, and yet so real that men will surrender for them food, shelter, comfort, ease, everything that the world can give. The true man will go bankrupt rather than break his word, or violate his conscience. He will starve rather than forsake his

ideal or betray his love. He will die, on the battlefield or on the scaffold, rather than desert the cause to which he has pledged his faith. Regulus, the Roman, went back to a death of hideous torture in Carthage rather than break his promise to his captors. Socrates chose deliberately to drink the hemlock, rather than escape through violation of the laws which he had sworn as a citizen to uphold. Jesus faced Calvary, and the ending of his work in tragic failure, rather than take up arms against those who came in arms against him. These, and thousands like them in every age, have been like Moses who chose "rather to suffer affliction with the people of God than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season." These afflictions were real in every material sense, but more real were virtue, honor, faith, righteousness, love. These things, invisible to every eye but the mind's eye, belong to the spirit and not to the flesh. Their rewards are "the fruits of the spirit," of which the animal is so unconscious and the unworthy man so contemptuous. But to the true man they are the only reality, and life a perpetual dedication to their service. It is this which we mean by the life of the spirit, and this also, I must believe, which we mean by the life of "him who is invisible." To love not the flesh but the spirit, this is to love God. For "God," said the Nazarene, "is spirit, and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth."

Here, now, are some answers to our question as to what it means to love God—all of them suggested by the single idea that God may be described, among other things, as "him who is invisible," him therefore "whom (we have) not seen." That these answers are inadequate, that they cover the whole ground, is of course not true; they represent only a single approach to a question which is as wide as the circle of experience. But they may be said, I believe, to give us at least some glimpse into the problem of the nature of God, and of that relationship between man and God which constitutes the essence of religion. Is it not possible to sum up this discussion, inadequate and one-sided as it has been, and present some conclusions to our thought which are fundamental?

In the first place it is evident, is it not, that religion has nothing essentially to do with creed and ritual, with ceremonial practices of any kind. "If thou bring thy gift to the altar," said Jesus, "and there rememberest that thy brother hath ought against thee, leave there thy gift before the altar and go thy way; first be reconciled to thy brother, and then come and offer thy gift." Religion, in other words, is a matter not of outward observance but of inward dedication. Religion is love, as "God is love."

In the second place, this love which is the heart of religion, must express itself first of all in the personal relation between man and man. "If a man say, I love God, and hateth his brother, he is a liar; for he that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, how can he love God whom he hath not seen?" So intimate and immediate is the love of man for man, as the primary expression of religion, that Jesus used a still more vivid word than that of "brother" to describe his meaning. He talked always of "neighbor," and defined that neighbor as any man with whom we came in contact on the road of life.

But the love of man for man, in terms of personal relationship, does not exhaust our problem. Beyond the narrow reaches of our present experience, there is the vast area of the unseen and the unknown—this world of the infinite which hides the farthest goals of truth and love, this world of the eternal which hides the destiny of man, this world of the spiritual which hides the mystery and the secret of all life. It is here, in this realm of the unseen and the unknown, that God in all his wonder is to be found; and it is here that he is to be truly loved. To follow truth for its own sake, to do right because it is right, to love not merely men but man, to "seek first the Kingdom"—this it is to love God. On the human side, I would define the love of God as the service of man in his eternal quest of the True, the Beautiful, and the Good. On the divine side, I would define the love of God as the sublimation of man's soul unto the likeness of those infinite and eternal realities of the spirit which are God.

Love, from its awful throne of patient power
In the wise heart, from the last giddy hour
Of dead endurance, from the slippery steep
And narrow verge of crag-like agony, springs
And folds over the world its healing wings . . .
To suffer woes that Hope thinks infinite;
To forgive wrongs darker than death or night;
To defy power, which seems omnipotent;
To love and bear; to hope till Hope creates
From its own wreck the thing it contemplates;
Neither to change nor falter, nor repent;
This . . . is to be
Good, great and joyous, beautiful and free;
This is alone Life, Joy, Empire and Victory.

DR. ANNA SHAW.

She cut a path through tangled underwood
Of old traditions out to broader ways.
She lived to hear her work called brave and good,
But oh! The thorns before the crown of bays.
The world gives lashes to its pioneers
Until the goal is reached—than deafening cheers.

—*The Commoner.*

Disarmament, more especially naval disarmament, should have been effectively dealt with in the Versailles Treaty. The continued increase of naval armament since that treaty is presumably for war at a time when the world has resolved itself to peace and, in any event, is so exhausted that another war in our generation will mean the dissolution of society. The money spent upon it since the armistice would have contributed materially to the entire economic rehabilitation of the world.

There is no more inconceivable folly than this continued riot of expenditure on battleships at a time when great masses of humanity are dying of starvation in certain parts of the world, parallel with bursting warehouses of rotting food in other places. The continued waste of the world's energies and resources in such foolishness instead of moving these commodities from centers of surplus to centers of famine is one of the most amazing failures of statesmanship of our times.—*Herbert Hoover.*

AFTER MANY DAYS.

In my love for Mother Nature
I was wont to pick and choose;
So it was I never found her
Till I went with worn-out shoes!

JAMES WALDO FAWCETT.

CONTRIBUTED

A Naval Holiday

"I must say that I am genuinely alarmed about the expenditure on armaments. I feel confident that if it goes on it will end in great disaster. If we had international co-operation we might do something in the direction I have indicated, especially after the events of last year, when it is fresh in the minds of the people what a horrible thing war can be and how ruinous to the commercial, industrial and social life of the countries subjected to its ravages!"—*Mr. Lloyd George, House of Commons, August* 13, 1913.

This is not the first time Britain has made the suggestion of a naval holiday. On the last occasion Mr. Winston Churchill was First Lord of the Admiralty, and at Manchester, October 18, 1913, he delivered a speech on the naval position of the Powers in which he dealt in detail with his scheme:

"You will remember the proposals which I made in introducing the Navy Estimates of this year for what has been called a naval holiday. . . . Our relations with Germany have greatly improved without the loss of our friendships with other countries. The moment, therefore, is not unfavorable for taking up the friendly reference to the question of a naval holiday which is to be found in the German Chancellor's speech. . . . Now we say, while there is plenty of time, in all friendship and sincerity to our great neighbor Germany: If you will put off beginning your two ships for twelve months from the ordinary date when you would have begun them, we will put off beginning our four ships, in absolute good faith for exactly the same period! That would mean that there would be a complete holiday for one year so far as big ships are concerned between Great Britain and Germany. There would be a saving, spread over three years, of nearly six millions to Germany, and of nearly twelve millions to this country, and the relative strength of the two countries would be unchanged."

This proposal, seemingly so reasonable and fair, was made by the government because its naval policy was severely condemned in the country. The by-elections revealed a state of dissatisfaction; government candidates lost seats or were returned by the skin of their teeth. There were moreover other reasons for the proposal. By August, 1912, all the military and naval secret plans of the Entente were completed. Sazonov's letters to the Czar are explicit on this point. He said, "England promised to support France on land by sending an expedition of 100,000 to the Belgian border to repel the invasion of France by the German army through Belgium expected by the French General Staff," and that King George "exclaimed that in the event of a conflict the latter (Great Britain) will be bound to cause fatal consequences not only to the German war fleet but also to the German merchant marine, for 'we shall sink every single German ship we get hold of.' These last words apparently reflect not only the personal feeling of his majesty but also the prevailing frame of mind toward Germany in England."

A glance at the British White Paper of 1914 giving the expenditure of the great Powers on new naval construction shows clearly what had taken place in "the mad race for armaments" and the position assumed by the Entente against Germany when the naval holiday was proposed:

	Great Britain	France	Russia	Germany
1909	£11,076,551	£4,517,766	£ 1,758,487	£10,177,062
1910	14,755,289	4,977,682	1,424,013	11,392,856
1911	15,148,171	5,876,659	3,216,396	11,710,859
1912	16,132,558	7,114,876	6,897,580	11,491,187
1913	16,883,875	8,893,064	12,082,516	11,010,883

These figures indicate in unmistakable terms the preparations secretly made for the war which Lord Fisher predicted, in a written memorandum and personally to Sir Maurice Hankey, the Secretary of the Committee of Imperial Defense, "would certainly occur in August, 1914."

There are however other figures to be considered if an impartial judgment is to be formed as to the practicability of the "naval holiday" suggested by Mr. Churchill, and these figures are those for the expenditure on gross and new construction of both naval groups in that year.

GROSS EXPENDITURE, 1913

Triple Entente....£96,310,842 Triple Alliance...£43,697,098

NEW CONSTRUCTION, 1913

Triple Entente....£37,859,455 Triple Alliance...£18,232,820

It may be urged by some keen students of foreign affairs that Italy's expenditure should not be included in the Triple Alliance group because she was bound to France by a secret naval treaty which precluded her taking part in this war. Be that as it may, it is undoubtedly true the German Naval Staff. did not rely on her assistance. Bernhardi himself said Germany did not count on Italy.

The suggestion of the "naval holiday" was merely another case of heads, I win; tails, you lose. Germany could not entertain the idea so long as France and Russia, the allies of Britain, were increasing their naval expenditure by leaps and bounds. Anyway, Mr. Churchill's proposal was for the year 1914, "or, if it was thought 1914 was too near, then for 1915." No one knew better than Mr. Churchill that Germany could not seriously entertain the suggestion of a "naval holiday" without the prospect of checking the building plans of France and Russia. Mr. Churchill knew 1914 was the year set by Fisher and his friends for "the inevitable war." In the House of Commons, March 26, 1913, when he introduced the navy estimates, he said:

"The influence of the British and German governments acting together for the peace and welfare of the world is priceless and measureless, and if an arrangement entered into between them—be it only for one particular year—for the prevention of what can plainly be shown to be a wasteful, purposeless and futile folly were to acquire a wider international scope and significance, there would be all the more cause for general rejoicing and all the more honor to those who had taken any part in bringing it about."

This suggestion was met with the usual jingo frantic yell, and a story was concocted and circulated in the war-press that Germany had replied to it by announcing "a greatly swollen program of expenditure on naval and military matters." The British navy estimates in March showed a net increase of £1,233,900 over those of the preceding year. The position in Germany at that time is reflected in the report from Berlin to M. Pichon, French Minister of For-

eign Affairs: "It is hardly likely that Germany will take the risk if France can make it clear to the world that the Entente Cordiale and the Russian Alliance are not merely diplomatic fictions but realities which exist and will make themselves felt. *The English fleet inspires a wholesome terror.*" (No. 5, French Yellow Book.)

That being the feeling in Germany, it is not surprising Mr. Churchill's proposal came to naught. For those who now favor the notion of a "naval holiday" it might not be amiss if a backward glance be taken at the naval development of European Powers, beginning at 1887, when the German imperialists raised the cry "Colonies for Germany."

Great Britain	France	Russia	Germany
£12,375,000	£8,452,000	£4,352,000	£4,179,000

In 1892 the French fleet visited Kronstadt, and in 1893 the Russian fleet visited Toulon. Soon after the fleets had exchanged visits, the Franco-Russian Alliance was consummated. This diplomatic military and naval agreement was the cause of the change in foreign policy which fostered "the mad race for armaments." England began at once to build against the Franco-Russian combination, and Germany also took precautionary measures.

Gross Naval Expenditure, 1897

Great Britain	France	Russia	Germany
£21,972,000	£10,444,000	£6,239,000	£6,467,000

These vast increases are significant. France and Russia combined spent that year over £10,000,000 more than Germany. Then in 1898, the year before the Boer War, Britain raised her expenditure to £25,674,000, Germany, on the other hand, reduced hers to £5,972,000. Regard the development of naval activity over eleven years:

	France	Russia	Germany
1890	£ 8,060,000	£ 4,360,000	£4,938,000
1901	13,107,701	11,659,766	9,624,956

Speaking in the Reichstag in defense of his naval policy, in 1900, Von Tirpitz said:

"We should be in a position to blockade the Russian fleet in the Baltic ports and to prevent at the same time the entrance to that sea of a French fleet. We must also protect our ports in the North Sea from blockade."

After the Boer War, in 1904, the year in which the Anglo-French agreement was signed, the figures for gross expenditure were:

Great Britain	France	Russia	Germany
£42,431,000	£12,517,143	£12,072,381	£11,659,000

At the time of the jingo panic in England, 1906, the naval tonnage of Great Britain exceeded that of France, Russia and Germany combined by 23,925 tons. The panic was caused by the reduction in the British naval and military estimates made by Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman's ministry. Then followed the Mulliner-Balfour campaign against the government which culminated in the jingo orgy of 1909. Mulliner was a managing director of the Coventry Ordnance Company. In the "History of a Great Scare," Mr. Perris said: "For three years this gentleman gave himself to the work of propagating the myth of a gigantic expansion of Krupp's works in particular and of German acceleration in general. It was an underground campaign . . . of this 'information' I need now say nothing more than that, as soon as it became public, it was emphatically contradicted by Messrs. Krupp, through Mr. John Leyland and other correspondents, and after some years was practically admitted by the government to be false and that time has proved that it never had any real basis." "We want eight (dreadnaughts) and we won't wait," was the cry of jingoes all over the country. That campaign, however, made war inevitable, for Mulliner, Balfour and Company forced the government to increase enormously naval plans and expenditure. Von Tirpitz told the Budget Committee of the Reichstag on March 17, 1909, that there would be only 13 ships ready in the autumn of 1912; the British Cabinet, however, figured out the myth-spinning Mulliner's calculation to give Germany 17 ships ready by March, 1912. Time revealed the trick played on the government: On March 31, 1912, Germany had *only nine* dreadnaught battleships and cruisers ready. The enormous advance in naval expenditure scared Sir Edward Grey, who told the House of Commons "that one-half of the national revenue of the great countries in Europe is being spent on what are, after all, preparations to kill each other. Surely the extent to which this expenditure has grown really becomes a satire and a reflection on civilization." What had been done in the way of preparing for war, *so that peace might be maintained*, can be seen in the following comparison of strength of the British naval forces actually in commission in home waters:

	Battleships	First-class Cruisers	Smaller Cruisers, Gunboats
1904	16	13	30
1910	44	37	58
	Destroyers	Torpedo Boats	Submarines
1904	24	16	nil
1910	121	88	59

Two panics, 1906 and 1909, both arising out of the dissemination of utterly false information, were the cause of the enormous development of British naval strength.

The German Fleet Law was laid down in 1905, the year after the publication of the Anglo-French agreement. The dates on which the German Fleet Law was announced were June 5th, 1906, and April 18th, 1908. The alteration of June, 1906, increased the number of large cruisers to be built under the Fleet Law by six; that of April, 1908, increased the number of battleships by four. Before the German Fleet Law was amended for the second time the navies of the first three Powers were as follows:

	Battleships	Armored Cruisers	Destroyers
Great Britain	57	34	142
France	21	19	48
Germany	22	8	61

In March, 1911, Sir Edward Grey came to the defence of Mr. McKenna, First Lord of the Admiralty, when the navy estimates were introduced:

"The First Lord has had a very difficult task. He has had to stand against panic and scare, notably in the election before last greatly fomented by the calculations made by the right honorable gentleman (Mr. Balfour) which, when the calculations proved to be mistaken, disappeared."

Mr. McKenna was followed at the Admiralty by Mr. Churchill, the minister who suggested a "naval

holiday." It is well to look at the progress of the three naval groups at that time.

NEW CONSTRUCTION EXPENDITURE OF ENTENTE POWERS AND TRIPLE ALLIANCE

	1911	1912
Great Britain	£15,148,171	£16,132,558
France	5,876,659	7,114,876
Russia	3,216,396	6,897,580
	£24,241,226	£30,145,014
Germany	£11,710,859	£11,491,187
Italy	2,677,302	3,227,000
Austria	3,125,000	5,114,206
	£17,513,161	£19,832,393

So the fateful year was ushered in; the year of complete understanding when Sazonov reported to the Czar. After six years of Liberal-Imperialist foreign policy Lord Rosebery at Glasgow, January, 1912, said:

"This we do know about our foreign policy, that, for good or for evil, we are now embraced in the midst of the Continental System. That I regard as perhaps the gravest fact in the later portion of my life."

The year before "the inevitable war," when Mr. Churchill threw out the suggestion of a "naval holiday," the race for naval supremacy was nearing its end. The figures of gross and new construction expenditure of the three groups tell their own tale:

GROSS EXPENDITURE, 1913

Great Britain	£49,625,636	Germany	£23,030,633
France	21,292,422	Austria	7,332,703
Russia	25,392,784	Italy	13,333,762
Triple Entente	£96,310,842	Triple Alliance	£43,697,098

NEW CONSTRUCTION, 1913

Great Britain	£16,883,875	Germany	£11,010,883
France	8,893,064	Austria	3,288,937
Russia	12,082,516	Italy	3,933,000
Triple Entente	£37,859,455	Triple Alliance	£18,232,820

At Manchester in February, 1914, Sir Edward Grey said: "While British naval expenditure is a great factor in the naval expenditure in Europe, the forces which are making that expenditure increase generally are really beyond our control. I admit that we had some responsibility originally in building the first dreadnaught. No doubt we are open to criticism that we set the example."

There it is: build the first dreadnaught to keep peace and expenditure soon passes from one's control, then prepare for the inevitable war. When Lord Fisher wrote to King Edward saying it seemed to him "simply a sagacious act on England's part to seize the German fleet when it was so very easy of accomplishment," he thought it could be done without bloodshed. That was in 1907. In that letter to the King Lord Fisher said Germany "has been paralyzed by the dreadnaught," and he adds:

"Now this is the truth. England has seven dreadnaughts and three dreadnaught battle cruisers (which last three are, in my opinion, far better than dreadnaughts); total, ten dreadnaughts built and building, while Germany in March last had not begun even one dreadnaught. It is doubtful if, even so late as May last, a German dreadnaught had been commenced. . . . As stated in an Admiralty official document, dated August 22nd, 1907: 'We have 123 destroyers and 40 submarines. The Germans have 48 destroyers and 1 submarine.' Admiral Tirpitz, the German Minister of Marine, has just stated, in a secret official document, that the English navy is now four times stronger than the German navy. Yes, that is so, and we are going to keep the British navy at that strength, *vide* ten dreadnaughts built and building and not one German dreadnaught commenced last May. But we don't want to parade all this to the world at large."

It might be worth understanding the conditions connected with the pre-war suggestion for a "naval holiday" before a decision is taken on this which is now engaging the attention of the public and Congress.

FRANCIS NEILSON.

SELECTED

A Saint of the New Dispensation

In these days when we of American citizenship pay increasing tribute to the noble women of our time and country, who strive and suffer for the uplift of their own sex and the general community, it may newly inspire and strengthen us in this good purpose to read the following appreciation of the life-work of an enlightened brave and loving worker for human equality, social emancipation and civilization, in a far-away Eastern land still dominated by caste, prejudice and superstition, but over which the light is breaking with prophetic foregleams of a better time coming in home and school, in state and church.

We condense from the columns of the Brahmo organ, *The Indian Messenger,* this touching tribute to a noble Hindu woman and pioneer of modern Indian society. C. W. W.

The funeral ceremony of the late Mrs. K. Ranga Rao was performed by her eldest son, Mr. Kudmul Deva Rao at Teynampet House, Madras, according to Brahmo (Somaj) rites. Only a few intimate friends were present besides the members of the family. Srimati Lalita Bai, the eldest daughter of Mrs. Rao, read the following paper giving a few facts about the life of the noble lady, for the rest and peace of whose soul they had met to pray:

"On this solemn occasion of the consecration of my beloved mother, I have deemed it my duty as her eldest daughter to say a few words about her life history.

My mother was born in 1862 in Kasergode in South Canara District. Her father was the Head Clerk of the District Court in that station. She was married to my father in 1870 when she was barely eight years old and my father, twelve. In 1879, my father's father died in abject poverty leaving behind him a widow and several little children, dependent on my father as the eldest son. For a number of years after that, it was a period of intense suffering from poverty. My mother was very hard working, and not only did her duties as housewife quite contentedly without any servant to help her, but when the misery of poverty reached the climax and my father prepared to go to Bombay to make a living there, she did not allow him to go. But she parted with her jewels one by one to supplement his scanty income as school-master, and encouraged him to start life as an advocate, saying that God would help him. In 1886, better days dawned for my dear parents. The subsequent history became a history of social and religious progress in

which my mother was a perfectly contented partner to my father. Far from living in luxury and affluence, which is generally supposed to be the characteristic of women, she ardently supported her husband in his social and charitable work.

In 1897, they had the first inter-caste dinner in a small thatched house where my parents were then living. It was the first inter-caste dinner and was in honor of a great friend of my father. My mother, far from opposing it, whole-heartedly worked for it. This dinner proved to be the precursor of many that followed it. The friends of my father occasionally coming from different parts of India, and of whatever caste or creed, appreciated the kind hospitality of my mother.

Her ardent sympathy for female education and reform in marriage also deserves mention. My sister and I were attending the St. Ann's School which was a long way from our house. We had to be sent our midday meal, for which a caste servant not being available owing to social persecution, she employed a so-called low-caste servant. After our course of study in that school was over she ventured to send us to the Boys' College, not minding public remarks and criticism. On the other hand she took care that no whisper of the public criticism and opposition reached our ears, lest we should feel unhappy. Though she herself had not received any modern education and knew and read only a little Marati and Canarese, her enthusiasm for higher education was very great. When my sister and I passed our first Examination in Arts in 1909 she herself took my sister to Madras where she had not been till then, arranged for her lodging in the Y. W. C. A., for studying in the Presidenoy College of Madras. One inter-caste marriage and two widow-marriages became possible in our family owing to her whole-hearted sympathy and co-operation.

In connection with the cause of the Depressed classes in the District of South Canara, she had also her share of persecution and ridicule from the public. When in 1907, the Central School of the Mission was started and my father began to treat the "Untouchables" as touchables and subjected himself to ridicule and persecution, she was insulted on the public road by *jutka* drivers and coolies as a pariah woman. She quietly submitted to the insult and jovially communicated the news to us at home. When her second son, Sanjiva Rao, now no more, then a boy of fourteen years, was insulted by a shop-keeper, calling him a pariah boy and refusing him admission into the shop, and the boy with tears complained to mother, she laughed at him and told him he was a silly boy to mind such things done out of ignorance. When our cook, and other servants deserted us and boycotted our family, she saw to the comforts of her home and blessed it with happiness. In 1910, she went to Bombay with my father, to leave her widowed sister-in-law in the widows' refuge, with the idea of starting a charitable institution like that, in Mangalore. Her many acts of kindness and benevolence are too numerous to be enumerated.

It is a consolation to us that these last few years she was highly respected and esteemed in society, and even the very critics and persecutors of old realized her merits. It was a great satisfaction to her that she lived to see it becoming common now in our district to educate girls, and therefore marry them at an older age. Non-Brahmins and even Christian servants are being engaged to prepare meals for Brahmin girls.

During the last days of my dear mother, the doctors, in appreciation of her services to society, deemed it an honor to render her the best medical help and could not be prevailed upon to accept remuneration for their services. After her death, even the most orthodox women considered it a privilege to pay respects to her remains.

While we deeply grieve for our beloved mother's loss we at the same time feel grateful to God for having spared her to us these many years. Our endeavor now is to ever keep alive within us whatever she loved and strove for, and pray to God to help us to be successful. May He bless us all and give eternal peace and everlasting joy to the dear departed soul."

THE STUDY TABLE

Recent Books About Birth Control

WOMAN AND THE NEW RACE. Margaret Sanger. Brentano's: New York.

The latest of the products of Margaret Sanger's pen reflects the high courage and clear thinking which has for many years been characteristic of this martyr in one of the most difficult and most valuable movements toward human freedom that has yet braved a conservative and conventional world. "Woman and the New Race" states with force and conviction the social, economic and spiritual reasons for the absolute emancipation of womanhood, more particularly for a free motherhood, unfettered by man-made laws, sex ignorance and lack of the power of choice in those questions which most vitally affect woman's life and that of the race. And the primary reason advanced for this emancipation is its ennobling effect on the race which shall spring from it. The emancipation is advocated, needless to say, in the interests of a more perfect motherhood.

Mrs. Sanger points with no uncertain touch the evils of the age-long subjection of woman, of motherhood enforced without her will or choice, regardless of physical or economic ability to care for the children so produced, of wifehood enforced by law at the will of the husband and even against the desire of the wife, of the shutting out of woman from the activities and interests of normal human living with the result that she is more female than human and hence entirely unfit to give to her children the all-round training in humanhood which alone can make them fit members of the race.

She also depicts fearlessly and with appalling statistics the status of the practice of abortion in the United States which compares most unfavorably with that in countries which have laws permitting the use of contraceptives. She analyzes the economic effects of large families which supply the cheap labor and the "cannon fodder" desired by the capitalistic and imperialistic rulers of society. She shows the effect on the nation's health of lack of sex knowledge on the part of parents who from physical or hereditary taint are unfit to bring children into the world. She discusses frankly the evils of those attempts at birth regulation which are based on unnatural and unscientific theories of the value of repression of the normal sex instinct, and most justly condemns the distorted idea which through all the Christian centuries has "regarded the sex-life as in itself unclean." The

analysis of the attitude of the church on this question and the reasons which have governed its position and led it to desire sex-ignorance on the part of women is searching, and finely summarized in the following paragraph:

> The church clings to this last stronghold of ignorance, knowing that woman free from sexual domination would produce a race spiritually free and strong enough to break the last of the bonds of intellectual darkness.

The history of the persecution of the advocates of birth control is briefly sketched, including the imprisonment a few years ago of the author, and the hunger strike of Miss Ethel Byrne, a trained nurse also arrested in the Sanger clinic. The New York courts have since held that under the New York statutes physicians and nurses have a right to impart information concerning contraceptives when necessary for curing or preventing disease.

This decision, the new and fine literature of the subject now available, the healthy public discussion of the problems of sex, the action of many women's clubs, all are milestones on the road opened by the martyrdom of those women, and the need is to carry on the work until there is nowhere a state whose laws prevent the free dissemination of methods and means for voluntary motherhood.

The goals to be attained by such laws cannot be better stated than in certain paragraphs of the closing chapter of this very remarkable little volume which should be read by every woman who cares for her own welfare, that of her husband or child, or of the race:

> Voluntary motherhood implies a new morality . . . which will first of all prevent the submergence of womanhood into motherhood. . . . Woman has given her children what little she was permitted to give, but of herself, of her personality, almost nothing . . .
>
> It is the essential function of voluntary motherhood to choose its own mate, to determine the time of child-bearing and to regulate strictly the number of offspring. . . . This will procure for her the time necessary to the development of other faculties than that of reproduction. She will give play to her tastes, her talents and her ambitions. She will become a full-rounded human being. . . . .
>
> In all of the animal species below the human, motherhood has a clearly discernible superiority over fatherhood. . . . Why is this not true of human beings? Because the female's functions in those animal species are not limited to motherhood alone. Every organ and faculty is fully employed and perfected.
>
> Birth control . . . is nothing more or less than the facilitation of the process of weeding out the unfit, of preventing the birth of defectives, or of those who will become defectives. So, in compliance with nature's plan, we must permit womanhood its full development before we can expect of it efficient motherhood.
>
> Voluntary motherhood also implies the right of marriage without maternity. Two utterly different functions are developed in the two relationships. In order to give the mate relationship its full and free play, it is necessary that no woman shall be a mother against her will. . . . It is as important to the race as to the woman, for through it is developed that high love impulse which, conveyed to the child, attunes and perfects its being. . . . It is from such soil that new life should spring. It is the inherent right of the new life to have its inception in such physical ground, in such spiritual atmosphere. The child thus born is indeed a child of love and tremendous joy. It has within it the seeds of courage and of power. . . .
>
> A free womanhood turns of its own desire to a free and happy motherhood, a motherhood which does not submerge the woman but which is enriched because she is unsubmerged. . . . The daughters of such women will not be given over to prostitution and injustice; the sons will not perish in industry nor upon the battlefield. . . . Childhood and youth will be too valuable in the eyes of society to waste them in the murderous mills of blind greed and hate. . . .
>
> Abused soil brings forth stunted growths. . . . Great beings come forth at the call of high desire. Fearless motherhood goes out in love and passion for justice for all mankind. It brings forth fruits after its own kind. When the womb becomes fruitful through the desire of an aspiring love, another Newton will come forth to unlock further the secrets of the earth and stars. There will come a Plato who will be understood, a Socrates who will drink no hemlock, a Jesus who will not die upon the cross. These, and the race that is to be in America, await upon a motherhood that is to be sacred because it is free.

CHILDREN BY CHANCE OR BY CHOICE. William Hawley Smith. The Gorham Press: Boston, Mass. 360 pages.

This volume in a way covers the same ground as "Woman and the New Race," but in a much more elaborated and detailed manner. It is less vigorous and incisive, more argumentative and prolix, its argumentation often being prolonged to the point of weariness. It stresses the personal and individual advantages of birth control methods more than it does the social and racial benefits, though the latter are by no means overlooked. Mr. Smith bases his argument for "children by choice" on the advantage to the parents, the child and the race of the production of children by act of will rather than by chance, but his primary emphasis seems to be on the greatly enlarged freedom for "affectional sex-expression" which birth-control measures will give to husband and wife. The author fills what to the modern point of view may seem an unnecessary amount of space in proving the value and the social and religious rightness of such expression as distinct from "reproductive sex-expression," arguing rightly that just as such functions of animal life as sight, hearing or the desire for food have been, through the "plus of humanity," enormously extended in expression and purpose in human living, so humanity has rightly added to the mere reproductive function of sex as it exists in the animal world an esthetic, affectional, spiritual plus which is of infinite value in man's higher development. This "plus of humanity" Mr. Smith defines as "all those qualities and attainments which have been acquired by man through the exercise of his own power of *choice* rather than at the hands of chance."

The author points out those forces which have always opposed knowledge of contraceptives for the common people because of selfish interest in an overcrowded population—first the makers of wars who want soldiers; second, the church, who wants adherents; and third capital, which wants cheap laborers.

Mr. Smith's arguments are based primarily on scientific and ethical principles, but he also seeks to give them a Biblical and religious sanction. The book will doubtless be helpful to many who are not yet ready for Mrs. Sanger's more advanced method of treatment and is certainly far beyond the muddled and cloudy thinking or refusal to think which characterizes the majority of Americans today. To quote Mr. Smith:

> The ascetics of ancient days are no longer counted as the greatest among men and women; and the fact that negation alone never led to human progress and positive results is universally acknowledged by all sane-thinking people. Use and not abuse is the constant law of right living and of wholesome growth for all the sons and daughters of men; and the principle applies to all the qualities and faculties which go to make up the totality of human belongings.

SUSAN QUACKENBUSH.

THE FIELD

UNITY.

Every member of the Community Church should be a reader of UNITY, the weekly magazine of freedom, fellowship and character in religion, founded and published from 1880 until his death in 1918 by Jenkin Lloyd Jones, and now edited by John Haynes Holmes and Francis Neilson.

For twenty-five cents in stamps and coin, sent to UNITY, 700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago, Ill., any friend may receive two sample copies of recent issues containing Mr. Fawcett's article on violence and the labor movement based on Mr. Holmes's recent book; and Mr. Holmes's study of contemporary English and American poetry.

The Community Church, New York.

THE ASSOCIATION TO ABOLISH WAR.

OUR AIMS

We hold it possible to outlaw war within this generation. We have plenty of impelling reasons to believe this. To this end we propose to move on the following lines:

First, we mean to call things by their right names. War is nothing less than a system of hideous slaughter of our fellow men. A declaration of war serves to open the door for breaking all the commandments. We propose to make war execrable, as we have already made slavery and the traffic in strong drinks.

We therefore protest forthwith against the idea that a free democratic people should ever be rushed into the most momentous act in a nation's life, without first knowing what a proposed war is about, or the war aims of the government. Such an occasion surely requires a plebiscite. There must also be adequate guarantees against the injustice of conscription and the moral cruelty of forcing men to fight against their judgment and conscience.

We are opposed to the very beginning of military training in the schools, and we especially protest against any compulsory feature in the effort to accustom our youth to the postures and the spirit of the military system.

We propose to seek a decided vote as early as possible from all sorts of societies—Chambers of Commerce, Women's Clubs, Civic groups and the like, and later from Legislatures and the Congress of the United States, expressing the determination of the American people never to carry on war against any nation.

We call it outrageous to think of war at all over questions of tariff and trade, or to collect debts, or to defend the property or the life of citizens who take ventures in uncivilized countries or in times of special disturbance. What right have our nationals to expect better treatment for themselves in the countries where they reside or travel than the people of such countries can procure for themselves?

We believe the time has come to put away the suspicion that any nations in the world are meditating injustice against the nations of America. Urging honorable conduct toward all nations, and the attitude of such confidence in all of them as we wish them to show us, we hold that the Monroe Doctrine can never justify us in threatening a sister nation with war. Our sole use in future for this time-honored policy must therefore consist in establishing the most friendly relations with the States to the South of us.

We propose to encourage every step anywhere taken toward the entire disarmament of the nations; we will stand for every item of reduction that may be made in the army and navy of the United States. We hold that we must do generously, and be first to do ourselves, what we wish other people to do.

We favor agreements among the nations to settle their differences of every kind, like sensible men, by straightforward judicial or arbitral means, to the utter disuse of the barbarous ordeal of battle. We hope to see our nation joined in a general system of such agreements with every other nation in the world.

We favor every movement, social and friendly, commercial, scientific, hygienic or political, which brings men and women together from every land in consulta-

(*Continued on page 32*)

Endowment Fund Letters

A most inspiring and encouraging correspondence has been coming into UNITY office recently as the result of the effort to secure an additional Endowment Fund for the paper. It is perhaps true that the inspiration has been more that of approving words and heartfelt praise than of actual dollars and cents, for apparently the most ardent admirers of UNITY are least able to express themselves financially. We would like to suggest to those of our readers who have been better favored in this world's goods that if they would give in the same proportion to their income that some of our correspondents have, we would soon have the Endowment Fund raised. However, the Fund is growing slowly and we are going to share with our readers some of the bouquets that have come to us.

Accompanying two gifts of stamps are these two notes, which are typical of a number of letters, some with small enclosures, some without any:

I regret that I am unable to assist in getting the Endowment Fund, the more because I am only a reader of UNITY because Mr. Jones would not drop my name out, having been a subscriber from an early day, and too poor to pay longer. I send the thirty cents as being better than nothing. . . .I am old and cannot expect to read anything much longer.

I earnestly wish I could send what UNITY is worth to me. My income is $20 a month and there are too many calls upon it to let me send more, but my blessing goes with it and maybe my need of UNITY and love of it will count.

Another friend writes with her gift of a dollar:

Enclosed you will find my widow's mite. Wish it could be larger, but as I am an elderly woman past seventy-one, my only income that of a G. A. R. widow (less than a dollar a day, you know), I feel that is all I can give.

Still another makes a suggestion that we would like to see carried out:

I feel ashamed to enclose so small a sum as one dollar as my contribution to the UNITY Endowment Fund, but I realize that if all who can spare one dollar will send it, it will yet count for a nice little sum to add to the hundreds and thousands that the more favored children of fortune will contribute. If ever I am in better financial circumstances, I will not forget UNITY, for there is need for such a brave fighter to win the battle for humanity.

Yes, I not only subscribed what I could ill afford to that 1906-1907 Endowment Fund, but I have taken UNITY from its first issue when I was an active P. O. Mission worker. But I am now drained absolutely dry. . . . At seventy-one with no one to look out for me, I must decide what to do to conserve.

My business was broken up by the storm of hate and passion that has recently passed over our fair land. I am only one of many who suffered by speaking the truth. Consequently my slender income will not allow a contribution at this time. I want still to be considered a member of the UNITY family and some day I may be able to help more.

Accompanying a pledge for twenty dollars comes this hearty word:

I wish that I could afford to contribute more. I want to see UNITY, the outspoken friend of liberalism and the love of Jenkin Lloyd Jones's heart, continue its good work.

Another good friend whose income has been depleted by the "slump" in dividends, writes:

Indeed I am a friend of UNITY and would be only too happy if I could assist in prolonging the life and prosperity of the best paper I have ever been in the way of reading. Have had it all these years and must if possible continue if I beg the subscription from some one here. I am eighty-one years old and have had it since the first publication.

. . . I take this opportunity to express my appreciation and thanks for the many beautiful articles and poems.

. . . UNITY must be continued by all means and I know you will succeed in raising the required amount.

I am very deeply interested in UNITY and in all that it represents including the work of my good friends, Mr. Holmes and Mr. Neilson.

tion for the common welfare. Such meetings help to constitute a genuine League to Ensure Peace, to promote an intelligent and fair-minded public opinion, and to set forth the ideals of humanity and civilization.

We protest, however, against any plan to set up a Super-State with authority vested in officials to carry out their decrees by military force. We hold that men and nations must be patient with one another, and be willing on occasion to wait and do together at a later time what they cannot yet do with good will and the general consent.

While we think the time has come for the stronger nations to help the weak, we protest against every form of assumed protectorate which has to be acquired in or maintained by invasion, by warships and by garrisons. We believe that no government is wise or good enough to be trusted with imperialistic means or purposes. We would depend upon the beneficent influence of honorable commerce, of free international travel, of hospitals and scientific systems of world hygiene, supplemented at times by political advisers selected from the best public men of a more favored nation by the leaders of a distressed people, and serving under the light of a truthful publicity.

Finally, we look to the time, not necessarily far away, when the Army and Navy Departments shall be abrogated from the Constitution of our government, and the State Department shall become an active Bureau of International Good Will.

WRIGHT & COMPANY
STEAM—DOMESTIC
COAL
TELEPHONE WABASH 5028
Main Office:
28 E. Jackson Blvd.
CHICAGO

Schumann & Company
Cleaners of
FANCY GOWNS AND KID GLOVES
Having winter garments cleaned before storing them will keep out moth
PHONE DREXEL 231
ALL DEPARTMENTS
MAIN OFFICE AND WORKS
3954 Cottage Grove Avenue

Bowman Dairy Company
MILK BOTTLED IN THE COUNTRY
Milk Cream Butter Buttermilk
DO OUR WAGONS SERVE YOU?
WHY NOT HAVE THE BEST?
4221-4229 State Street Telephones at all Division Offices
EVANSTON CHICAGO OAK PARK

Phone Oakland 489 JANITORS' SUPPLIES
Everything in HARDWARE
AT
PORTER'S
4236 Cottage Grove Ave.

UNITY is a weekly paper which for forty-two years, under the editorship of Jenkin Lloyd Jones, upheld the fundamental principles of religion, political economy, and social relations; and this policy is maintained under the new editors, John Haynes Holmes and Francis Neilson. During the War UNITY was steadfast to the cause of righteousness and good will among the peoples of the earth. It has constantly dealt with the grave economic and political problems of Europe and the rest of the world in a straightforward unflinching manner, and it has from time to time published information of deep interest to its readers with which no other paper in the United States has dealt. It is non-sectarian. It advocates free religion and equal opportunity, as the means of uniting all peoples in the bonds of fellowship and amity. UNITY seeks to direct the minds of its readers to all that is best in the world of thought as expressed in the literature of the day, and its literary reviews are not the least valuable part of the several departments which its staff conducts from week to week. There are men and women of international renown writing for its columns and its subscribers are to be found in all the important countries of the world.

If these principles appeal to you, will you not subscribe and interest your friends?

UNITY PUBLISHING COMPANY
700 Oakwood Boulevard Chicago, Illinois

$3.00 ($3.50 in Canada; $4.00 in other countries) for a year's subscription to UNITY, or 50 cents for a ten weeks' trial subscription to UNITY. Single copies, 10 cents.

Name .....City .....

Street .....State .....